

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 15-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended for clarity. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,399) in view of Hull et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,375,835). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Margalit and Hull, alone or combined, fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious the claim 1 combination of features including "wherein the function implementing unit, after instruction data is stored in the storing unit via the interface by the external personal computer without being recognized by the function implementing unit, automatically reads the stored instruction data from the storing unit via the interface," as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action acknowledges that Margalit does not disclose the function implementing unit automatically reading the stored instruction data from the storing unit without being recognized by the function implementing unit, but appears to rely on Hull for allegedly disclosing the above feature (see page 4 of the Office Action). In particular, the Office Action cites the following portions of Hull:

Col. 18, lines 10-16: "One skilled in the art will recognize that other transmission techniques besides e-mail messages can be used to transmit print authorization 401, print request 402, print-ready document 115, and confirmation. E-mail messages are advantageous because they may be sent between PC 109 and PC 230 even if a firewall is present; however, in alternative embodiments other transmission techniques may be used."

Col. 18, lines 24-31: "E-mail processing software 104, installed on printer 102, recognizes emailed print commands from PC 109, retrieves print-ready documents 115 from such messages, and prints documents 115 accordingly. In one embodiment, print-ready

documents 115 are provided in PostScript format, or in some other format that printer 102 is capable of reading and printing without requiring installation or execution of any particular software application."

Col. 18, lines 45-53: "Software 104 and 233 periodically poll an e-mail server (not shown) associated with PC 203 or printer 102 to determine whether there are any new e-mail messages requesting or authorizing printing. Such polling may be performed using known functional capabilities of e-mail clients such as, for example, Microsoft Outlook, or it can be programmed as a function of software 104 and 233 so as to be independent of any particular e-mail client software application."

The above passages of Hull are irrelevant to the features of claim 1. The above passages merely disclose transmitting print-ready electronic documents to a printer using e-mail. A source PC transmits a document in print-ready format so that the printer need not run or activate the software application. The document is thus printed while preserving the user's selected print setting and preferences. Hull does not disclose "wherein the function implementing unit, after instruction data is stored in the storing unit via the interface by the external personal computer without being recognized by the function implementing unit, automatically reads the stored instruction data from the storing unit via the interface," as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over Margalit and Hull. Claims 6, 7 and 19 depend from independent claim 1, and are patentable for at least their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit in view of Hull and further in view of Yoneta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,699); rejects claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit in view of Hull and further in view of

Murata (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,659); and rejects claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit in view of Hull and further in view of Yoneta and Murata. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-5 and 15-18 depend from independent claim 1, which is in condition for allowance. The other references do not cure the deficiencies in the claim 1 rejection. Therefore, claims 2-5 and 15-18 are also patentable for at least their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Patrick T. Muffo
Registration No. 60,342

JAO:PTM/emd

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 23, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461